



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/607,810

06/27/2003

Andrew J. Hamel

3002.P0312US

6273

30497 7590 10/03/2008  
FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C.  
2026 RAMBLING ROAD  
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631

EXAMINER

JIANG, YONG HANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2612

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/03/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/607,810

Applicant(s)

HAMEL ET AL.

Examiner

YONG HANG JIANG

Art Unit

2612

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/27/2003, 1/3/2005, 3/10/2006, 4/25/2006,
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

5/8/2008.



**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Claims 1-13 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/18/2008.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 29, the limitation "a second controller" on line 8 implies there is a first controller. However, no first controller is mentioned in claims 27 or 29.

Therefore, the cited limitation rendered claim 29 indefinite.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. (US 2002/0156466), and further in view of King (US 6,359,348).

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Sakurai discloses a system (via a surgical system, See the Abstract and Figures 1-4 and 9) to allow an operator to control a plurality of medical devices (ultrasonic generator 2 and electric cautery apparatus 3) during a medical procedure, the system comprising:

- a foot-operated control console (via foot switch unit 51) to allow an operator to control the plurality of medical devices (Figure 1), the foot-operated control console including

- a plurality of controls for operation by a foot of the operator (via pedals A and B), the plurality of controls including a selection control (via pedals A or B on foot switch 4 for selectively issuing a treatment start command to the ultrasonic generator 2 or the electric cautery apparatus 3, Paragraph 33) to allow the operator to select a device to be controlled from among the plurality of medical devices;

- a first plurality of control signals responsive to operation of the plurality of controls (via operation signal outputted from foot switch 4, Paragraph 33);

- a controller to control the operation of the medical devices in response to operation of the plurality of controls (via foot switch controller 5 built within the foot switch unit 4, Paragraph 92). (See Paragraphs 31-32 and 92)

Sakurai did not specifically disclose the system is endoscopic. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that endoscopic procedures are common medical practice. Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system to allow endoscopic procedures in the foot operated system.

The system of Sakurai accepts control inputs directly using wires; Sakurai did not disclose the system further comprising a wireless transmitter to transmit over a wireless medium a selection signal responsive to operation of the selection control; a wireless receiver to receive the selection signal and the first plurality of control signals via the wireless medium; a data communication device to transmit a second plurality of control signals to the selected device over a wired communication medium, based on the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal; and a second controller to control the data communication device in response to the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal, including generating the second plurality of control signals based on the first plurality of control signals so that the second plurality of control signals are compatible with the selected device, as indicated by the selection signal.

However, transmitting control signals wirelessly to gain the advantage of remotely controlling a device from a distance and prevention from unnecessary entanglement from wires is well known in the art at the time the invention is made. In one example, King teaches a remote control system to remotely actuate the door or trunk lock of a vehicle using a fob. The system has a receiver (via receiver network) to receive wireless control signals; a microprocessor (36) to execute the received control signal and sending a signal to actuate the selected lock (See the Abstract, Col. 3, lines 46-62).

The system of Sakurai is wired and controlled by a controller; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the

system wireless, then it is obvious to include a second controller at the receiver side in order to generate the control signals to control the equipment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the foot-operated control console (See figure 9) of Sakurai to be wireless, and the system of Sakurai to further include a wireless transmitter to transmit over a wireless medium a selection signal responsive to operation of the selection control; a wireless receiver to receive the selection signal and the first plurality of control signals via the wireless medium; a data communication device to transmit a second plurality of control signals to the selected device over a wired communication medium, based on the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal; and a second controller to control the data communication device in response to the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal, including generating the second plurality of control signals based on the first plurality of control signals so that the second plurality of control signals are compatible with the selected device, as indicated by the selection signal in order to gain the advantage of remotely controlling a device from a distance and prevention from unnecessary entanglement from the use of wires.

6. Claims 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. in view of King, and further in view of Stephens (US 5,734,254).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Sakurai and King did not disclose the foot-operated control console further includes: a battery sealed within the foot-operated control console, to power the foot-operated control console; However, the examiner

takes Official Notice that it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the control console to include a battery within a remote control console in order to make the control console free from electrical wires to power the control console, thereby making the control console more portable and convenient to use.

Sakurai did not disclose the control console further includes: an induction element; and a charging circuit to control charging of the battery by power electromagnetically induced in the induction element.

Stephens teaches a battery charging system for charging batteries from a portable appliance. The system comprises an induction element (transformer winding 32, Figure 1), and a charging circuit (via power converter 30 including voltage and drive level control, and current limiting, See Col. 3, lines 34-41) to control charging of the battery by power electromagnetically induced in the induction element. (See the Abstract)

From the teachings of Stephens, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the control console of the combination of Sakurai and King to include an induction element; and a charging circuit to control charging of the battery by power electromagnetically induced in the induction element as taught by Stephens to charge a battery in a portable electronic device.

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Sakurai and King did not disclose the foot-operated control console further includes a removable battery to power the foot-operated control console; and wherein the system further comprises a charger to



receive and charge the battery when the battery is removed from the foot-operated control console.

Stephens discloses portable devices such as notebook computers have removable batteries; Stephens teaches a battery charging system for charging removable batteries from portable devices. (See the Abstract)

From the teachings of Stephens, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai and King to include the foot-operated control console further includes a removable battery to power the foot-operated control console; and wherein the system further comprises a charger to receive and charge the battery when the battery is removed from the foot-operated control console as taught by Stephens to use a battery charging system for charging removable batteries from portable devices.

7. Claims 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. in view of King and Stephens, and further in view of Snyder et al. (US 6,043,626).

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Sakurai, King and Stephens discloses the structural elements of the claimed invention, wherein Stephens discloses the system comprises a charging station (via adapter 40) including: an induction coil (via transformer winding 62), coupled to a power supply (AC/DC converter 70), to cause the battery in the foot-operated control console to be charged inductively when the foot-operated control console is coupled to a charging station (See Figure 1 and Col. 4, lines 7-21).

But the combination of Sakurai, King and Stephens did not specifically disclose the charging system further including a receptacle to receive the foot-operated control console.

Snyder teaches a portable electronic device holder having a housing defining a receptacle (via a cradle) for holding and charging an electronic device. (See the Abstract and Figures 1-3)

From the teachings of Snyder, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai, King, and Stephens to modify the charging station to include a receptacle to receive the foot-operated control console as taught by Snyder to secure the control console while it is charging on the charging station.

Regarding claim 18, the combination of Sakurai, King, Stephens, and Snyder disclose the claimed invention, wherein Snyder discloses the docking station includes a receptacle (via a cradle, See Figures 1-3) to physically couple to the foot-operated control console.

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Sakurai, King, Stephens, and Snyder disclose the claimed invention, wherein Snyder discloses the charging station is an element of the docking station (via the portable electronic holder includes a charger, See the Abstract).

Regarding claim 21, the combination of Sakurai, King, Stephens, and Snyder disclose the structural elements of the claimed invention, but did not disclose the receiver unit is contained within the docking station. The examiner takes Official Notice

that common wireless house phones have a receiver in the docking station to receive signals transmitted by the phone. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai, King, Stephens, and Snyder to include the receiver unit is contained within the docking station in order to communicate with the docking station when the control console is at a distance.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. in view of King, Stephens, and Snyder et al., and further in view of Skowronski (US 6,926,130).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Sakurai, King, Stephens, and Snyder did not disclose the charging station is retractably coupled to the docking station.

Skowronski teaches a portable docking station and cord reel assembly made for hand held electronic devices including a retractable data cable (56) to extend the cable when the cable needs to be longer and retract the cable when the cable is not used. (See the Abstract and Col. 8, lines 35-51 and Figure 1)

From the teachings of Skowronski, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai, King, Stephens, and Snyder to include the charging station is retractably coupled to the docking station as taught by Skowronski to extend the charging station to make it more flexible when in use.

9. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. in view of King, and further in view of Wang et al. (US 5,524,180).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Sakurai discloses the plurality of controls includes a plurality of foot pedal (via pedal A and B, See figure 1), but Sakurai did not disclose the plurality of controls includes a plurality of foot switches.

Wang teaches a foot operated surgical system with a plurality of controls including a foot pedal and a foot-switch (via pedal 22, first foot switch 58, and second foot switch 60). (See the Abstract, and Col. 4, lines 13-16 and Figure 4)

From the teachings of Wang, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai and King to include the plurality of controls includes a plurality of foot switches as taught by Wang to control more functions of the foot operated system if more functions are needed in the foot operated system.

10. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. in view of King, and further in view of Yaroch (US 5,790,065).

Regarding claim 25, the combination of Sakurai and King did not disclose the first controller is configured to cause the wireless transmitter to transmit a device identifier in association with the first plurality of control signals, the device identifier for associating the foot operated control console with the receiver unit.

Yaroch teaches an example protocol for an RF transmission signal from a pushbutton RF transmitter. Each transmission from the RF transmitter has a predetermined modulation to digitally encode an identifier portion (47). The identifier portion (47) is used to tell the receiver which RF transmitter transmitted the signal (e.g.,

a separate identifier code is given for each type or manufacturer of the remote transmitter). (See the Abstract and Col. 3, lines 38-45)

From the teachings of Yaroach, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai and King to include the first controller is configured to cause the wireless transmitter to transmit a device identifier in association with the first plurality of control signals, the device identifier for associating the foot operated control console with the receiver unit as taught by Yaroach to identify the control signals transmitted by the wireless transmitter, thereby restricting the control of medical devices to specified controls signals only.

11. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. in view of King, and further in view of Linhares (US 5,336,218).

Regarding claim 26, the combination of Sakurai and King discloses the structural elements of the claimed invention wherein Sakurai discloses the foot-operated control console further comprises a housing to contain the wireless transmitter and the first controller (See figure 9), but the combination of Sakurai and King did not disclose the housing having an attachment to allow a suction hose to be attached to the housing.

Linhares teaches a surgical system with a suction hose attachment (28) to allow the surgical system to be use with different pieces of equipment. (See figure 1 and Col. 3, lines 27-45)

From the teachings of Linhares, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai

and King to include the housing having an attachment to allow a suction hose to be attached to the housing as taught by Linhares to allow the console to be used with other equipments.

12. Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai (US 2002/0156466) in view of Wang et al. (US 5,524,180), King (US 6,359,348), and Stephens (US 5,734,254).

Regarding claims 27 and 29, Sakurai discloses an apparatus (via surgical system, See the Abstract and Figures 1-4 and 9) to allow an operator to control a plurality of medical devices (ultrasonic generator 2 and electric cautery apparatus 3) during an endoscopic medical procedure, the apparatus comprising:

a housing designed to be situated on a floor surface of an area in which the endoscopic medical procedure is performed during the endoscopic medical procedure (See figure 9);

a plurality of controls within the housing, designed to be operated by a foot of the operator to control the plurality of medical devices, the plurality of controls including a plurality of foot pedals (via Pedals A and B, Figure 1);

But Sakurai did not disclose the plurality of controls include a plurality of foot switches, and the plurality of foot switches including a selection switch to allow the operator to select a device to be controlled from among the plurality of medical devices.

Wang teaches a foot operated surgical system with a plurality of controls including s foot pedal and foot switches (via pedal 22, first foot switch 58, and second foot switch 60). (See the Abstract, and Col. 4, lines 13-16 and Figure 4)

From the teachings of Wang, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sakurai to include the plurality of controls includes a plurality of foot switches, and the plurality of foot switches including a selection switch to allow the operator to select a device to be controlled from among the plurality of medical devices as taught by Wang to control more functions of the foot operated system if more functions are needed in the foot operated system.

The system of Sakurai accepts control inputs directly using wires, and the control signals generated by the plurality of controls are transmitted through the wires. Sakurai did not disclose a wireless transmitter within the housing, to transmit over a wireless medium a selection signal to cause a remote receiver unit to select the device to be controlled and a first plurality of control signals to cause the remote receiver unit to control the selected device in response to operation of the controls; a wireless receiver to receive the selection signal and the first plurality of control signals via the wireless medium; a data communication device to transmit a second plurality of control signals to the selected device over a wired communication medium, based on the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal; and a second controller to control the data communication device in response to the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal, including generating the second plurality of control signals based on the first plurality of control signals so that the second plurality of control signals are compatible with the selected device, as indicated by the selection signal.

However, transmitting control signals wirelessly to gain the advantage of remotely controlling a device from a distance and prevention from unnecessary entanglement from wires is well known in the art at the time the invention is made. In one example, King teaches a remote control system to remotely actuate the door or trunk lock of a vehicle using a fob. The system has a receiver (via receiver network) to receive wireless control signals; a microprocessor (36) to execute the received control signal and sending a signal to actuate the selected lock (See the Abstract, Col. 3, lines 46-62)

The system of Sakurai is wired and controlled by a controller; if the system is modified by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the system wireless, then it is obvious to include a second controller at the receiver side in order to generate the control signals to control the equipment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sakurai to include a wireless transmitter within the housing, to transmit over a wireless medium a selection signal to cause a remote receiver unit to select the device to be controlled and a first plurality of control signals to cause the remote receiver unit to control the selected device in response to operation of the controls; a wireless receiver to receive the selection signal and the first plurality of control signals via the wireless medium; a data communication device to transmit a second plurality of control signals to the selected device over a wired communication medium, based on the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal; and a second controller to control the data communication device in



response to the first plurality of control signals and the selection signal, including generating the second plurality of control signals based on the first plurality of control signals so that the second plurality of control signals are compatible with the selected device, as indicated by the selection signal.

Sakurai did not disclose a rechargeable battery within the housing, to power the foot-operated control console; an induction coil within the housing; and a charging circuit within the housing, coupled to the battery and the induction coil, to control charging of the battery by power induced in the induction coil by a source outside the housing.

Stephens teaches a battery charging system for charging batteries from a portable appliance. The system comprises an induction element (transformer winding 32, Figure 1), and a charging circuit (via power converter 30 including voltage and drive level control, and current limiting, See Col. 3, lines 34-41) to control charging of the battery by power electromagnetically induced in the induction element. (See the Abstract).

From the teachings of Stephens, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the housing of Sakurai to include a rechargeable battery within the housing, to power the foot-operated control console; an induction coil within the housing; and a charging circuit within the housing, coupled to the battery and the induction coil, to control charging of the battery by power induced in the induction coil by a source outside the housing in order to make the

system more mobile by eliminating the need for a power cord and lower costs by making the battery rechargeable.

13. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai in view of Wang et al., King, and Stephens as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Yaroch (US 5,790,065).

Regarding claim 28, the combination of Sakurai, Wang, King and Stephens discloses the structural elements of the claimed invention wherein Sakurai discloses a controller within the housing (via foot switch controller 5, See paragraph 92 and Figure 9) to control the wireless transmitter in response to operation of the controls.

But Sakurai did not disclose the controller causes the wireless transmitter to transmit a device identifier in association with the control signals, the device identifier for uniquely associating the apparatus with the receiver unit.

Yaroch teaches an example protocol for an RF transmission signal from a pushbutton RF transmitter. Each transmission from the RF transmitter has a predetermined modulation to digitally encode an identifier portion (47). The identifier portion (47) is used to tell the receiver which RF transmitter transmitted the signal (e.g., a separate identifier code is given for each type or manufacturer of the remote transmitter). (See the Abstract and Col. 3, lines 38-45)

From the teachings of Yaroch, it would have been obvious to modify the combination of Sakurai, Wang, King and Stephens to include the controller causes the wireless transmitter to transmit a device identifier in association with the control signals, the device identifier for uniquely associating the apparatus with the receiver unit as

taught by Yaroch to identify the control signals transmitted by the wireless transmitter, thereby restricting the control of medical devices to apparatus only.

14. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai in view of Wang et al., King, and Stephens as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Linhares (US 5,336,218).

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Sakurai, Wang, King and Stephens did not disclose the housing has an attachment to allow a suction hose to be attached to the housing.

Linhares teaches a surgical system with a suction hose attachment (28) to allow the surgical system to be use with different pieces of equipment. (See figure 1 and Col. 3, lines 27-45)

From the teachings of Linhares, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Sakurai, Wang, King and Stephens to include the housing having an attachment to allow a suction hose to be attached to the housing as taught by Linhares to allow the housing to be used with other equipments.

### ***Conclusion***

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YONG HANG JIANG whose telephone number is (571)270-3024. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian A. Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-3059. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2612

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Y. J./

Examiner, Art Unit 2612

/Brian A Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2612